

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/937,326	BESEMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C. Lynne Anderson	3761	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) C. Lynne Anderson. (3) Travis Boone.
 (2) Larry Schwartz. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 March 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: 6,521,087

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: please see below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

The applicant argued that the prior art fails to explicitly teach the combination of a superabsorbent and gluconolactone, and further do not teach the combination in the claimed percentages. Applicant will submit further arguments in writing.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required